IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

THURSDAY, THE 1ST FEBRUARY 2007 / 12TH MAGHA 1928

WP(C).No. 31788 of 2006(H)

PETITIONER:

MANOJ V., S/O. VIJAYAKUMAR, AGED 26 YEARS,
MADATHIL HOUSE, MURIYAD P.O.,
KALLETTINKARA, THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.K.MOHANAKANNAN
SMT.A.R.PRAVITHA

RESPONDENTS:

THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
THRISSUR.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.PUSHPALATHA

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 01/02/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) NO.31788/2006

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1:- COPY OF THE PERMIT WITH NECESSARY ENDORSEMENT DT.25.2.05 ISSUED BY THE RTA, THRISSUR .

**EXT.P2:_ COPY OF THE ORD
ION MVARP NO.103/2006 DT.1.8.06 OF STAT, ERNAKULAM.**

E.XT.P3:- COPY OF THE ORDER DT.22.8.05 IN MVARP NO.158/2005 OF STAT, ERNAKULAM

/TRUE COPY/

tss

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

WP(C).No.31788 of 2006-H

Dated this the Ist day of February, 2007.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has approached this court alleging that the direction of the S.T.A.T. contained in Ext.P2 order dated 1-8-2006 is not implemented. The petitioner moved the Secretary, R.T.A. to revise the time schedule of his vehicle KL-4P 463 operating on the route Irinjalakuda-Ayyanthole. The Secretary, R.T.A. rejected the said representation by order dated 18-1-2006. M.V.A.R.P.No.103/2006 was filed challenging that order. By Ext.P2, the said revision was allowed. The operative portion of the said order reads as follows:

> "Hence the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remanded to fresh consideration as directed in the MVARP 158/05. If the time cannot be settled on consensus of the parties, the secretary may dispose the matter on merit with a speaking order."

The grievance of the petitioner is that so far the above quoted direction has not been implemented.

2. The learned Government Pleader, upon instruction, submitted that timing conference to implement Ext.P2 is scheduled to be held on

23-4-2007.

3. I think there is no justification for postponing the holding of the timing conference. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent to settle the time schedule as directed in Ext.P2 order, within two months from the date of production of a copy of this judgment.

The writ petition is disposed of as above.

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,
MS JUDGE.